



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,049	07/12/2006	Osvaldo L. Podhajcer	15138-003US1	6069
26161	7590	03/30/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				HIRIYANNA, KELAGINAMANE T
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1633		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
03/30/2009			ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/563,049	PODHAJCER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	KELAGINAMANE T. HIRIYANNA	1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 47-82 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 47-82 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

The inventions as claimed are classified into following groups:

- I. Claims 47-67 drawn to a method of diagnosing a non-central nervous system (CNS) disorder and detecting expression of a gene in CNS and comparing gene expression profile of Non-CNS disorder and the match indicating the subject has or will develop the non CNS-disorder..
- II. Claims 68-74 drawn to a method of diagnosing a non-central nervous system (CNS) disorder and detecting expression of multiple genes in CNS and comparing said gene expression profiles of Non-CNS disorder and the match indicating the subject has or will develop the non CNS-disorder.
- III. Claims 75-79 drawn to a method of identifying disease surveillance gene for a non-CNS disorder comprising inducing a non-CNS disorder in a test experimental animal comparing the gene expression profiles and selecting a disease surveillance gene.
- IV. Claims 80-82 drawn to an reference gene expression profile of a mammal corresponding to the presence of a non-CNS disorder in a mammal comprising expression data of 5 or more genes differentially expressed in CNS and said mammal not having a specific non-CNS disorder.

The inventions listed as Groups I, II and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or

corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: a) a prior art of record exists regarding a feature linking technical claims correlation of expression profile of CNS and Non-CNS expression in diagnosing cancer (For example see WO/2000/70340; Petricoin et al., Lancet 2002, 359:572-577; Kaminski et al Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 2000, 97:1778-1783). The invention as a whole thus lacks unity under PCT rule hence a restriction as indicated above is proper. The mode of operation, and the effects evaluated in each of the above invention are distinct and different from the other. Therefore, a search and examination for the patentability of the above inventive groups together would generate an undue search burden on the examiner. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Should Group I be elected from above, the.

(a). Applicant is required chose a single species of protein among the proteins recited in claim 50 i.e., a hormone or a growth factor or an immune system component or a cytokine.

The species are independent or distinct because they are structurally different.

(b). Applicant is required chose a single species of a gene product encoded by the gene recited in claim 52 i.e., hepatocyte growth factor (HGF) or apherin A3 or chemokine (C-Cmotif) ligand 4 or growth differentiation factor-9b (GDF-9b) or bone morphogenetic protein 15 (BMP 15) or neuroblastoma suppressor of tumorigenicity 1 or melanocyte proliferating gene 1 or fibroblast growth factor 22 (FGF 22).

The species are independent or distinct because they are structurally different.

(c). Applicant is required chose a single species of brain cells among the recited in claims 54 i.e. the hypothalamus or the midbrain or the prefrontal cortex or the striatum.

The species are independent or distinct because they are structurally different and involved in different functional aspects of brain.

(d). Applicant is required chose a single species of non-CNS disorders among the disorders recited in claims 57 i.e., cancer or rheumatoid arthritis or asthma or diabetes or obesity.

The species are independent or distinct because they are clinically and etiologically distinct.

(e). Applicant is required chose a single species of carrier gene associated disorders among the recited in claims 67 i.e., BRCA1 or BRCA2 or hMSH2 or hMLH1 or hMSH6.

The species are independent or distinct because they are caused by structurally distinct genes.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Should Group II be elected from above, the.

Art Unit: 1633

(a). Applicant is required chose a single species of non-CNS disorders among the disorders recited in claims 70 i.e., cancer or rheumatoid arthritis or asthma or diabetes or obesity.

The species are independent or distinct because they are clinically and etiologically distinct.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Should Group III be elected from above, the.

(a). Applicant is required chose a single species of non-CNS disorders among the disorders recited in claims 78 i.e., rheumatoid arthritis or asthma or diabetes or obesity.

The species are independent or distinct because they are clinically and etiologically distinct.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Should Group IV be elected from above, the.

- (a). Applicant is required chose a single Figure of gene expression profile among the Figures recited in claims 81 i.e., Gene expression profile as in indicated in a single figure.
- (b). Applicant is required chose a single disease with selected 5 genes whose expression is profiled among the recited in claims 82 i.e., Breast cancer or colon cancer or Lung cancer or Arthritis or Asthma.

The species are independent or distinct because they are clinically and etiologically distinct diseases and the genes are structurally distinct.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must

include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Kelaginamane Hiriyanna Ph.D.*, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3307. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9 AM-5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Joseph Woitach Ph.D.*, may be reached at (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). When calling please have your application serial number or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO call center (UCC) at (800) 786-9199.

/Robert M Kelly/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633